

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/576,495	04/20/2006	Shunpei Yamazaki	740756-2954	3721	
22204 NIXON PEAR	7590 07/13/2010 RODY LLP	EXAMINER			
401 9TH STR		WON, BUMSUK			
SUITE 900 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20004-2128		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2889		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/13/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/576,495	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BUMSUK WON	2889	

	BUMSUK WON	2889						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this ication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time							
		in the final rejection whi	phouse is later. In					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of his Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS for this the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW. MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Sea MPEP 760.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension set have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extensions the under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) at set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lates than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on								
AMENDMENTS								
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the					
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. 		be entered and an e	planation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-47.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. \(\bigcirc The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because See Continuation Sheet.								
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:								
	/Bumsuk Won/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2889						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3, NOTE: The newly added claim limitations in claims 8, 25-27, 32, and 37 require further search/consideration,

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1, 5-7, 9, and 11, the applicant argues that the rejection under 35 USC 103 as being unpartentable over Yamazaki (US 2002/1014989) in or Tabuchi (US 2003/10599717) is improper because there is no teaching or suggestion to proceed to this combination, and the overall disclosure of Tabuchi (USC 47 amazaki. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted by the applicant, Tabuchi teaches forming coating layers 1-3, while Yamazaki teaches forming layers using vacuum related techniques. The applicant argues that a photocatalyst layer is NOT necessary to the invention of Yamazaki. The examiner respectfully diagrees that adding a photocatalyst layer is NOT necessary. however, the examiner notes that obviousness does not need to prove necessity to combine, instead the rejection under SUSC 103 is proper if one of ordinary skill in the art would combine. Here, Yamazaki discloses everying except for the photocatalyst layer, and Tabuchi discloses using a photocatalyst layer in an analogous device, for the prupose of improving strength of the layer among many other reasons for using hotocatalyst layer in a disable where the examiner maintains the rejection.